ORIGINAL

EPA PROPOSES FIRST CLEANUP PLAN

FOR THE OUTBOARD MARINE CORP., INC.,

PLANT 2 SITE

MR. JOYCE: Good evening, folks. My name is Mike Joyce with the US Environmental Protection Agency. Thanks for coming out on this winter's night to hear about our proposed plan for the OMC Plant No. 2. This is Kevin Adler, remedial project manager for Outboard Marine. As you can see, he's got a Power Point presentation. Anyone who doesn't have a facts sheet, let me know and we'll give you one of those to follow along with and to take home.

Also, if you've got cell phones, if you'd put them on vibrate that might be helpful for fear of going off from time to time. We may as well get started. There's free coffee in the lobby. And thanks to the City of Waukegan for providing us with this wonderful facility in their new City Hall.

MR. ADLER: Hello. My name is Kevin Adler. I'm the project manager for the Outboard Marine Corporation Superfund Site located here in Waukegan.

Tonight we're going to talk about the proposed plan for cleanup as part of the OMC Plant 2 site, which is a part of the Outboard Marine Corporation Superfund Site.

Tonight I'll present some information about OMC Plant 2. I'll present our proposed plan.

Again, if you have a facts sheet you may be able to follow along. Tonight we're also accepting public comments on our proposed plan. After my presentation, we'll have a question and answer time period.

Very briefly, what we are proposing to do is demolish the remaining part of the OMC Plant 2 and store the material accordingly either on-site or in an off-site landfill, depending how contaminated they are.

We also propose to dig up contaminated soil and sediment around the plant and dispose of that material either on the property or in an off-site landfill as appropriate. It could cost up to $20 million to do this work and take 17 to 20 months to complete it once we do start.

First I would like to introduce the OMC cleanup team. Myself, Kevin Adler. I'm the project manager with EPA. I started in 1986 and I was assigned to the OMC site in late 1999. Mike Joyce, the community involvement coordinator. He used to work for the Voice of America. Tom Martin is not here tonight. He is the attorney protecting our legal interests on the site. Ken Theisen, my on-scene coordinator, has done some removal actions out on the property to get

rid of some of the immediate health threats at the site.

Representatives from CHM2M Hill are here tonight, Jewelle Kaiser and Matt Bobenhauer (phonetic.) Matt worked on the feasibility study.

A couple other people not here, Frank Biros, with the Department of Justice in Washington. He's protecting the United States legal interest at this site. For example, Frank helped us obtain a $2.6 million settlement with the bankrupt OMC Corporation to use towards cleanup of the site.

Erin Rednour is the EPA project manager. The City of Waukegan has John Moore, city engineer. Sitting in front of John is Gary Deigan with Deigan & Associates, contractor for the City. Jeff Jeep is one of the attorneys to pursue the City's legal interest at the site.

And then we have the Waukegan Community Advisory Group. Not associated with the City of Waukegan, but is part of the Community Advisory Group, Susie Schreiber.

Very briefly, there are four parts to the OMC Superfund site. We have broken them into four to make it easier to handle. We call them operable

units. The first one is Waukegan Harbor; the second one is the Waukegan Coke Plant site; the third one are the PCB containment cells that we constructed as part of the first harbor cleanup action in 1990 to 1992; and the fourth one, the one we're talking about the most tonight, is the OMC Plant 2 site.

Here is a map of the property in question. To the north we have the harbor, the OMC Plant 2 building. You can see where the Coke Plant is on the east side of the harbor. The green area represents the cleaned up harbor from 1990 to 1992.

The red represents a former boat slip, which we converted into a PCB containment cell. Here's the OMC Plant 2 property. In an aerial photo you can see here's one containment cell and another containment cell and Boat Slip No. 3, just to give you a layout of the land. This is the one-million square foot building. Not all of it is there right now. The City has knocked down this portion.

Very briefly, OMC operated at the site from 1948 to about 2000 and manufactured outboard motors out there. They used PCBs in their hydraulic cutting fluid from about 1961 to 1972. Unfortunately, those cutting fluids were allowed to drain into the

harbor, into Slip #3, and it's the source of the PCB contamination in the Waukegan Harbor.

In Illinois, EPA forced OMC to do the first clean up of the harbor in 1990 to 1992, dredging most of the northern harbor area to a clean-up level of 50 parts per million per PCB. We created three contaminate cells, as I mentioned earlier, to contain material instead of disposing it off site.

In the process of creating a new boat slip to replace former Boat Slip #3, material was excavated out and that material was found to be contaminated with creosote and that led to the discovery of the adjacent Coke Plant site.

In December of 2000, OMC declared bankruptcy and most of the people were sent home. They could not reorganize, so in August of 2001 they were prepared to sell all the pieces off but could not sell OMC Plant 2, but did sell OMC Plant 1, the southern plant, mainly a testing facility.

The OMC bankruptcy trustee tried to petition the court to abandon the plant in the summer of 2002. The EPA stepped in and examined what was left behind or going to be left behind and we reached an agreement through the court with the trustee for the

trustee to do emergency cleanup action before it was allowed to legally abandon the plant in December of 2002.

When they legally abandoned the plant, EPA took over the operation plant of the PCB containment cells for one year and our authority ended and the State of Illinois took that task over. In July of 2005, the City of Waukegan took title to the property and assumed the operation maintenance of the containment cells.

The work we have done at Plant 2 is far-reaching. We first did interior cleanup of the plant in the spring of 2003 after the plant was legally abandoned. We removed even more chemicals that had been left behind. We emptied very large vat fulls of fluids and soap items that weren't necessarily a hazard as-is, but if somebody were to breech the vats we would have a large spill.

The City also is using grant money to perform the beach area sampling episode from 2004 to 2005. Mr. Deigan and his associates sampled the soil, sand and ground water in that area and presented the information to EPA. We incorporated that work into our remedial investigation, which we began in the fall of

2004.

Based on the City's information, EPA did another removal action out at the Plant 2 site where about 14,000 parts per million PCBs were found in the sand. We removed about 25,000 cubic yards of material and placed them in an off-site location. We completed our remedial investigation of Plant 2 in April of 2006 and completed our feasibility study in May of 2006.

We also, as our final removal action, cleaned out the storm sewers in OMC Plant 2 to prevent storm water from washing more PCBs out into the lake or into the harbor. After we completed our remedial investigation, we broke the OMC Plant 2 site into four media of concern; the building itself, the soil and the sediment around the building, the ground water beneath the building.

And what we found was -- the acronym is up there, DNAPL -- Dense Non-Aqueous Phased Liquid -- is, essentially, free-phased Trichloroethylene, a cleaning solvent, that OMC used to clean the parts before they made the boat engines.

It lies on the clay surface about 30 feet down below the ground surface. Not necessarily a hazard, but it does create a continual source of

contamination to the ground water beneath the site. This map is also found in the facts sheet. It's not in color. Essentially this shows you the two -- the area in blue and greenish tan here are building portions that are contaminated with PCBs.

The areas in red are all the areas of the soil around the building that we identified as areas of concern due to PCBs or Poly Aromatic Hydrocarbons, PAH for short, being above clean-up standards in the soil just due to the factory operating.

As I said, Plant 2, the building itself, the blue and this green area, contain PCBs on the concrete, the walls and the ceiling above levels that are considered to be harmful for human health or the environment.

Now, the City was told in February of this year which part of the buildings were, in fact, cleaned of PCBs and they acted very quickly to enact a demolition and disposal of the cleanup portions of the OMC Plant 2. You can talk to John if you want to see photos of his work.

This area here and this area here and soon the world headquarters building will be knocked

down by the City's contractor. There's a little bit more work being done in the basement of the building to remove piping and so forth. Those pipes are not contaminated.

Again, the soil and sediment outside the building are contaminated with PCBs above one part per million in the areas in red on that map. Poly aromatic hydrocarbons above two parts per million, which is the background level for PAH in the State of Illinois.

We found ground water contaminants beneath most of the site. It has not left the site yet. It is moving either towards the lake or towards Waukegan Harbor. It's moving very slowing and again it has not left the property.

We found a pool of TCE, approximately, in this area 30 feet down. We took our information gathered from investigating the building and soil and sediment around the site and used those numbers to estimate the impact on human health or the environment.

Based on our calculations, if somebody were to be trespassing inside the building and being exposed to PCBs on the remainder part of the building itself, our estimated risk is two-times ten to minus five, which is well within our clean-up risk range

goals for the Superfund, which is one times ten to minus four and one times ten to minus six. One in 10,000 to one in a million chances of contracting cancer if you are exposed to this chemical in your lifetime.

However, if the building were to remain as a factory and used by workers in the future, that risk would be much higher because they would be there more and exposed to more contaminants.

We estimated that risk to be two times ten to minus three, which is outside of our risk range and, therefore, subjects the building to Superfund cleanup action.

Outside in the soil and sediment, we looked at two items of concern, human health and environment receptors. Because of the PCB in the dunes land near the lake, we believe that small mammals and birds would be exposed to PCBs through either eating organisms that live in the ground or just being exposed to the sand itself.

In those people who use the beach recreationally, that means they don't live there everyday, they're not exposed to contaminants everyday, the residual contaminants left behind could present a

two times ten to minus four lifetime excess cancer risk.

Taking that into consideration, we had to evaluate potential cleanup actions for the building and for the soil and sediment. We're looking at potential cleanup actions for the ground water and the DNAPL in the future. Some of the considerations we had were the City now owns the property. They have a master plan for redeveloping the lakefront.

They're calling for high-density housing and shops and marine type development to be erected on the Coke Plant site and on the OMC Plant 2 site in the future.

They also are trying to coordinate further clean up of the Waukegan Harbor, because in 1992 we cleaned up the harbor 50 parts per million. In 2002, EPA did a review of that and we discovered that proper cleanup levels should be much lower than 50 parts per million PCBs in the sediment.

We just recently completed a risk assessment for the sediment in the Waukegan Harbor and we have a new cleanup goal at 0.2 parts per million of PCB. Taking those items into consideration, we looked at narrow cleanup alternatives. We didn't feel that

incinerating the soil or the building was practical or economical.

We looked at just decontaminating the inside of the building and leaving it for the City to do with it what it pleased, or we looked at decontamination and demolition and disposal and we also looked at decontamination and demolition with recycling of steel and copper and other material and then disposal of other contaminated materials which could not be cleaned up.

The debris we would obtain from knocking down the building, and we looked at two disposal options. We looked at placement of the material into an off-site municipal landfill if it did not exceed 50 parts per million PCB or into a Toxic Substance Control Act -- or TSCA -- if it was 50 parts per million or higher.

We did also look at and we are proposing tonight disposal of the material in an off-site TSCA cell if it was above 50 parts per million PCB and to consolidate the material that's not above 50 parts per million on site between the two containment cells that are there at the site already.

Here is the eastern containment cell and

the western containment cell and we would target this area here and place building debris and soil and sediment that was below 50 parts per million. And it's similar to what happened here in 1992.

Again, the soil and sediment cleanup options would be the same disposal options for getting rid of the debris. We excavated the contaminated material and either put it off site in an off-site landfill or consolidated on-site material that was below 50 parts per million PCB.

So our proposed plan for the building involves decontaminating the surface as appropriate, demolishing the building, recycling the steel and copper wire and any equipment that can be resold, using that proceed to help pay for the cleanup; dispose of off site any material above 50 parts per million PCB in a TSCA landfill and consolidate the rest of the material in an on-site berm between the two containment cells that are out there already.

Our proposed cleanup plan for the soil and sediment is to excavate the material and do the same thing for the building. Anything above 50 parts per million PCB would sent off site for disposal in a proper landfill and anything below would be

consolidated on site and managed well into the future.

So at the completion of our proposed cleanup work for tonight, you would see the building totally torn down, except for one portion of the building, which would be used in the future. The contaminated concrete slabs would be removed and disposed of.

The soil and sediment outside the building would be at residential cleanup levels or below; unfortunately, our work that we're proposing tonight would not do anything for the ground water or the DNAPL. Again, they're still studying that and planning to come back and talk to you about that in about a year and a half from now.

Here's a concept of what the site would look like after it's cleaned up. You're looking north at the treatment plant. The building cleanup cost is estimated at $14 million. That sounds like a lot, but we do have a lot of very contaminated material out there.

The concrete is very heavy and a lot of it is above 50 parts per million and would have to be sent off site for disposal. When you pay for disposal, the shipping is by the ton. The soil and sediment

estimated cleanup cost is about $6 million, not as much. And some of the savings between the two is for consolidation of material on site rather than sending it all off for disposal. Again, the total time to complete the work once it's begun is 16 to 20 months.

We examined our proposed plan using the nine criteria under the Superfund before presenting it to you tonight. We believe our proposed plan is protective of human health and the environment and that all of the contamination would be taken away and put into proper landfills or consolidation areas on the site and managed so contamination cannot come out and humans cannot come into contact with it.

Our work would meet all applicable laws and regulations. The short-term hazards are acceptable, because demolition work and excavation work is routinely done. The long-term results are acceptable I believe because we're reaching residential cleanup levels for the soil and sediment and we are removing what I heard is an eyesore from the lakefront.

One of the provisions under the nine criteria is to try to treat contaminations to the best extent possible and to destroy the contamination so you no longer have to deal with it again. In the case of

PCBs, the best way to treat it is to incinerate that and we didn't feel that was appropriate.

We have very little reduction in the toxicity, mobility or volume of PCB contaminated material according to this remedy, but we feel that our proposal does meet the other eight criteria very well. The work is readily implemented and the cost is not unreasonable for the benefits derived.

The state acceptance and your acceptance will be measured in our comment period, which ends on February 3rd; so after we receive your comments on our proposed plan, we would evaluate them and write an official cleanup action called "Record of Decision" stating what EPA plans to do out at the OMC Plant 2 site and the effective cleanup action.

We then produce the design plans and specifications for the work so we can put it out for bids. And we also would be completing our ground water and DNAPL studies. And then I have to get in line to get funding from headquarters to do the work.

The amount of cleanup money for Superfunding in the US has fallen over the years. Now headquarters is effecting the "Worst Sites First Policy." The worst site gets cleaned up before the

next worst site and I'm told that our site falls somewhere in the upper middle.

One more point is that we're going to try to coordinate with the harbor cleanup plant as best we can, but if the harbor goes first or we go first we're going to go ahead and do it if we're ready to go. And again, in about 18 months I'm going to be out here again talking to you proposing a ground water cleanup.

Do you have any questions before I do the pop quiz?

THE AUDIENCE: Your overall plan to clean up the environment, is that by Waukegan standards or would that be by Lake Forest or would that be --

MR. ADLER: By United States EPA standards.

THE AUDIENCE: Well, we all know that there's two standards that -- you guys don't have any money at all. I read the paper all the time and I know that the Bush Administration has X'd out funding for corporations to fund the Superfund, correct?

MR. ADLER: The tax on --

THE AUDIENCE: There's very little money.

MR. ADLER: The tax on people who produce potentially hazardous material has ended and that was several years ago, so the actual Superfund itself is

broke and now EPA receives all its money through acts of Congress. Tax dollars.

THE AUDIENCE: So the polluters are no longer liable?

MR. ADLER: They are still liable for sites that we find people who have polluted. Like at the Coke Plant site we have General Motors and North Shore Gas.

THE AUDIENCE: What I read out of here, even the most comprehensive -- the most expensive doesn't sound like it's buildable to me. That land will just be waste land from now until eternity, right?

MR. ADLER: No.

THE AUDIENCE: I must have misread it then.

MR. ADLER: The area of consolidation, if that's what you're pointing to, the berm area, is planned to be used as a park on top. What you have is the material placed down and a big cover of clean soil above it; so people can use the surface, because you are never going to come into contact with PCBs below.

THE AUDIENCE: Is this going to work like the Johns Manville site?

MR. ADLER: I don't know anything about the Johns Manville site, but this is my -- there's grass on

top of it and a big hill on the side of the road and then the condos in front of it.

THE AUDIENCE: It has 12 inches of soil over the bermed area?

MR. ADLER: Yes.

THE AUDIENCE: How far do you have to excavate to get rid of the PCBs?

MR. ADLER: I'm not reading you.

THE AUDIENCE: How far away from the water table is it going to be?

MR. ADLER: The consolidation area would be on top of the ground. It would not be on or in the water table.

THE AUDIENCE: Well, then how high is the berm, because it doesn't say --

MR. ADLER: It would be as high as necessary to create the disposal area. There's several --

THE AUDIENCE: That's extremely vague.

MR. ADLER: Let me finish. There are several piles of material that could be destined to go there. We have our material from the demolition of the building, the soil and sediment around it.

The City has identified plans to build wetlands near the property and dispose of that material

that may or may not be contaminated. There's a small amount of dirt on the Coke Plant site that needs to be moved. It could be up to 20 feet high. That's the maximum. It may be less. It depends how wide the base is of the material that you plan to spread.

I welcome you to comment on that during the comment period portion, if you don't believe that's adequate. We will listen and evaluate.

THE AUDIENCE: Could we safely put a shooting range on the land?

MR. ADLER: That's not up to me. You have to talk with the City. The City owns the property and they have -- if you've seen their master plan, I don't believe that a shooting range is identified --

MAYOR HYDE: No, no. I hope that answers your question.

THE AUDIENCE: You mentioned that there are two pollutants that have not yet been addressed for -- the ground water issue and the acronym -- I forget what it is.

Is there any possibility that as you address these two additional problems there may be problems addressing them that would impact feasibility of what you're now doing in the potential use of this

land for residential use, et cetera?

MR. ADLER: Yes and no. The ground water beneath the site we know is contaminated with trichloroethylene, which is a degreasing solvent. The acronym DNAPL, the Dense Non-Aqueous Phased Liquid, is pure trichloroethylene that has leaked down and falls to the lower surface and acts as a continual source of more TCE to the ground water.

Some of the concerns we have about that are that if buildings are built over it you could have an indoor air intrusion of trichloroethylene into the basement or the first floor of those buildings. That can be designed -- the building can be designed so you preclude vapor intrusion.

What we are looking at right now are testing two methods of treating ground water in place to destroy the trichloroethylene so we don't have to pump it out, run it through a treatment plant and pump it back into the ground.

What we're going to try to do is put food into the ground water so that the naturally-occuring bacteria can eat the TCE and break it down to an aqueous compound over a short period of time. That's what we're doing right now. We're

studying that.

We believe it will take about a year and a half to complete those studies and then we'll present that information to you. DNAPL itself is not harmful to humans. Nobody can get down 30 feet to come into contact with it. It's just a problem because it's a continual source of trichloroethylene to the ground water that's slowly flowing by.

We want to remove that source to the ground water before we address the entire plume, because if we address the plume first and then come after the DNAPL we'll recontaminate what we just addressed.

Removing the building will actually help us in the future, because we may have to inject a lot of material into the ground in a lot of spots out there and if the building and concrete slabs are out of the way that will make it easier for us to do so.

THE AUDIENCE: I have a lot of questions and one of them is this: What's the difference between the question and comment period? Because you made it sound like they're two --

MR. ADLER: We're accepting comments and your views on our proposal tonight. If you have questions

about what does this mean or what does that mean, you can ask them now or you can call me or e-mail me with those questions and I can try to answer them for you, because we're also accepting written or e-mail comments.

We have a court reporter taking down the proceedings and she will be providing for us your comments that you're making.

THE AUDIENCE: So will people be allowed to look at the report that --

MR. ADLER: Yes. Once it's completed.

THE AUDIENCE: Will it be at the library?

MR. ADLER: Yes.

THE AUDIENCE: The DNAPL that you talked about, where does that come from and how did you know it was there since it was 30 feet down?

THE REPORTER: Excuse me. I can't hear.

MR. ADLER: The Outboard Marine Corporation had records and we looked at their blueprints and noticed where they had above-ground or below-ground storage tanks for solvents and materials and we also know that they operated vapor and degreasers to get the grease off the parts before they were sent over to make the engine.

Wherever you have above- or below-ground storage facilities or large part washing machines like this, there's always the propensity for finding pools of liquid below the ground.

THE AUDIENCE: They were shipping it down --

MR. ADLER: No, they weren't shipping it down, there was leaking. You wouldn't want to send something that you paid for into the ground.

THE AUDIENCE: So they have like tanks down there and the tanks --

MR. ADLER: Right. Sort of like in a gas station. It's a product, you want to use it, but if it's leaking you don't notice it's polluting the ground beneath it.

THE AUDIENCE: Another question. You mentioned that in -- you are going to dredge the harbor --

MR. ADLER: That's a separate action.

THE AUDIENCE: Right. You wanted that new -- it has 50 parts per million and you wanted the --

MR. ADLER: 0.2.

THE AUDIENCE: So you want to clean the harbor up to 0.2, but yet you want to put in -- you want to put more -- you want to contain the PCBs on the

surface. That just doesn't -- this is close to Lake Michigan. Is that the most logical place to have -- to increase the containment cells?

It seems to me if you're going to clean the harbor to 0.2 parts per million you want to clean the containment cells, too. Why clean the harbor? That makes -- that's so clean and then have all this landfill that, you know, 49 and below parts per million?

MR. ADLER: First of all, the harbor cleanup action is not a part of that, but I know about the harbor cleanup action. 0.2 parts per million is the target cleanup action for the harbor, because that is the estimated level that would not impact fish and people are eating the fish and coming into contact and being exposed to PCBs in the fish.

We have a 0.2 parts per million cleanup action in the harbor sediment. We believe that PCB levels in the fish out there in the harbor that are being caught and eaten will fall below recommended levels for having "Do Not Eat" signs being placed up at the harbor.

THE AUDIENCE: What is the current in the harbor right now? How many parts per million? I

thought you cleaned it up more than --

MR. ADLER: The target cleanup level in 1990, 1992 was 50 parts per million. They did a pretty good job out there. Right now we're seeing an average of four parts per million and one little hot spot of 25 parts per million.

Now, PCBs are more hazardous in the water and the sediment, the water above it, because the Benthic organisms absorb the PCBs and then the fish eat those organisms and then we eat the fish. That's how it's biomagnified into a problem.

As far as the on-surface situation, our residential spill cleanup level for PCBs is one part per million. PCBs are not very soluble, so they don't go anywhere if water is poured through them necessarily. They cling to clay particles, so the only way they can move from the site is runoff.

So if we create a berm area out there that has soil covering over it, we believe it will have them contained in place that they can't move anywhere and also believe that people will not have routine reactions to them if they're walking on top of it.

If you disagree, that's okay with me. Please send me your official comment to that.

THE AUDIENCE: In the proposed containment cells, what will be the parts per million -- estimated parts per million in these containment cells?

MR. ADLER: It will be less than 50 parts per million, in the one that would be built. Right now --

THE AUDIENCE: It would be more concentrated though, because you're putting all the PCBs in one area, so wouldn't --

MR. ADLER: The material that we are removing from the Plant 2 building and the soil and sediment around the plant -- we're not talking about the harbor -- the stuff that we keep on site would be between one and 49 point whatever parts per million.

Anything over 50 would be sent off site for disposal; so it would be less than 50 parts per million.

THE AUDIENCE: By consolidating it, aren't you concentrating it?

MR. ADLER: By consolidating it we're not concentrating it. We're placing it in one are on the site for management.

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. I can't hear what they're saying back there.

MR. JOYCE: Wait, wait. We're not into the

comment period yet. Let's get any technical questions you might have about the material that Kevin presented and then when we're going to have a comment period we would ask you that step up here so that the court reporter can get your name and at least the town that you live in on the record.

We don't answer comments, but it's just your chance to make comments on the proposed plan. Do you have a question?

THE AUDIENCE: Yeah. Why don't you guys instead of demolishing it and doing all that just leave it there and just use it for future storage; Decontaminating the soil and leave it there for future storage for whatever buildings would be in there and not cost anything?

MR. ADLER: Here's why. These are the considerations we use in drafting a cleanup remedy. The City owns the site and they want to redevelop it. If we were to allow future workers in that plant as-is, the estimated risk would be two times ten to minus three or two in 1,000 chances that somebody would contract cancer during the time that they were working there due to PCBs being there.

THE AUDIENCE: You indicated $6 million for

soil removal. How deep are you going to be removing the soil?

MR. ADLER: Depending on where you are, it's between two and five feet, which is the volume of material that has to be removed and where you have to remove it from. We have some fragile areas on the dunes land area that we have to be careful with. There's some protected species of plants and water out there. It depends on where you have to put it. It would be more expensive to dispose of it off site. Transport it off site.

Anything above one parts per million PCB is a target for excavation and disposal; either containment on-site -- under our proposal, containment on-site or off-site disposal. Anything above two parts per million PAHs is also target for excavation and disposal.

THE AUDIENCE: (Inaudible.)

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. I didn't --

MR. ADLER: He asked about estimated yardage available for disposal. I don't have that number handy. I believe it was about 25,000 or more cubic yards of soil and about 30,000 yards of material from the building that would be consolidated between the

containment cells. I don't know the volume of material for off-site disposal.

It's found in our feasibility study, which is in the library. We can find that answer for you, if you need to know.

THE AUDIENCE: So there isn't going to be a capping off --

MR. ADLER: No. That would just be on the containment area. There would be a cover placed over that area.

THE AUDIENCE: The ground water -- is that ten feet a year or --

MR. ADLER: Neither one is very fast. It's not moving very quickly mainly because we have that million square-foot building there. That's preventing rainfall and snow melt and trickling into the ground and pushing it away.

It's less than 100 feet per year. It's moving towards the lake when you're up on the eastern side or moving towards the harbor when you're down towards the Larsen area.

THE AUDIENCE: The PCBs in the building, that would be concrete services, right?

MR. ADLER: Yes.

THE AUDIENCE: Could that be washed off where the risk to workers would have been eliminated if it had just been washed?

MR. ADLER: Sorry to interrupt. Yes. We tried to decontaminate the concrete surface when we did our first interior cleanup action in 2003. We tried do a swath about three-feet wide by a couple hundred feet long and it was not successful because the PBCs have seeped into that concrete about 19 inches.

THE AUDIENCE: And they're released as vapor?

MR. ADLER: Yes. If we go into some of the parts of the building, the vapor concentration of PCB is above NIOX standards.

THE AUDIENCE: Could it be encapsulated?

MR. ADLER: Not every easily.

THE AUDIENCE: A membrane with concrete poured over it?

MR. ADLER: That's what OMC did in the past. That's why it's down in some parts 19 inches.

THE AUDIENCE: I just asked, because some people in this town prepare industrial base over --

MR. ADLER: Right. We found PCBs in the middle of the concrete where they have used the surface in the past and then decided to pour more over it and

used the surface again and then that surface was also contaminated.

MR. JOYCE: Okay. If there are no more questions, why don't we start the comment period. Anyone who would like to make an oral comment. If you agree or disagree with any part of the proposed plan.

THE AUDIENCE: I was reading that there are some microbio means of removing PCBs. Why the containment?

MR. ADLER: Containment was the most cost-effective option. Incineration, it's very costly and it's hard to do properly so you don't release more contaminants into the environment. If you don't burn PCBs properly you can create dioxin, which is more harmful than PCBs.

There are innovative technologies being pursued for PCBs, but none of them have been proven to our satisfaction yet.

THE AUDIENCE: I know there's the advisory group that was formed for the harbor cleanup and, yes, this is part of the Superfund. Will there be a Citizen Advisory Committee for the OMC plant or --

MR. JOYCE: There are some members of the Citizen Advisory Group here and they addressed all the

Superfund sites and some that are not Superfund sites.

MS. SCHREIBER: Susie Schreiber. Our area of concern is the harbor --

MR. JOYCE: A little louder, please.

THE REPORTER: If she could come up here.

MS. SCHREIBER: Susie Schreiber in care of the Waukegan Harbor Citizen Advisory Group. The area of concern is the actual harbor and then those properties around it, the OMC property.

The extended area of concern goes to the middle of the dead river to the north and 22nd Street in North Chicago to the south; so in answer to your question, all of these properties fall into our work that we have been doing since August of 1990. I will give you my card here and you are welcome to ask any questions or get any information.

MR. ADLER: The next meeting is next Thursday at 6:00 o'clock. Anybody can come to the meeting.

THE AUDIENCE: How much is this going to cost the taxpayers of Waukegan?

MR. ADLER: Well, how many people live in Waukegan?

THE AUDIENCE: Under 90,000, roughly.

MR. ADLER: There's 300 million people in the

US. The US is going to pay for this and the state will pay 10 percent.

THE AUDIENCE: Well, the City doesn't ante up any money at all.

MR. ADLER: Not for the cleanup of the OMC Plant 2. The City is spending money now, however, in our agreement that it signed to take title to the property. They are in charge of operations and maintenance of the PCB containment as well and they are in charge of security for the OMC Plant 2 building as-is to help prevent break-ins and so forth so people don't get hurt breaking into the property.

So it's not like they are not going to be spending anything, but they are not going to be paying for the cleanup action that we proposed tonight.

THE AUDIENCE: One last question. You mentioned that the plan was contingent upon getting funding and we're sort of from the top end of the middle tier in severity on the list of sites.

Is there any way to make some sort of ballpark estimate as to when you might see actual dollars coming to fund this plant? You say it would take no more than two years or something. I mean, how long might we be waiting for the money to start?

MR. ADLER: I have been told no site has waited more than three years to get the dollars. Once we get money to start our work, we're more likely to get money to finish it.

What I've tried to do is break the site into two pieces, soil and the building, and maybe we'll get the money to do the soil and sediment first because that's outside the building and non-secured, as well as the building is. And then once we've got the sediment work underway and they come around again, I'll see how we can get the work done if we appropriate the other monies for the building demolition.

The second option is to find a developer in the City's plan to effect our cleanup actions that we determined for that site. The developer can pay to implement our cleanup action and we would be very happy to let them do that under our oversight.

The EPA has filed a lien on the property for any money that we spend investigating and cleaning up the OMC Plant 2 property will be going onto that lien so if the property is transferred by the City to a developer that lien will have to be satisfied.

MR. JOYCE: If you would step up and give your name and address. How about you, Mr. Mayor, would

you like to --

MAYOR HYDE: I have already -- we have already gone through this. Everything that we have proposed here tonight we're already working on, so what you listened to tonight, that site is going to be developed. It's going to be.

The plans, as you've said, what the City has made is already in motion. It's already in motion and taking place. With Sue's help and going along there and cleanup of the harbor and working with the port district to lower the docks that had to be dredged first to lower slips so they can become floating docks, that's all been worked on. And we should implement that, approximately, within six months and work can be -- if the people will get their butts in gear, that can be started next October.

So there's a lot of things that are going on. All of this has come up at council meetings, this has all come up in committee meetings, this has all come up in the paper. It's all there for you to read. Nothing is hidden.

If some help doesn't come from somebody, this is going to be completed. It might take 15 or 20 years, but it's going to be completed. If things

happen, it might be a little sooner, but it's going to happen. It's already started.

And the council with Tony Figgaroa (phonetic), they're committed. The City, the administration, is committed to see that this project starts and goes through. We won't be around in 15, 20 years, and neither will any of you, but it's going to be -- all I can tell you is it's started.

It's taking place right now. And thank Heaven for the one-cent sales tax. That helps. And so far of every -- it was probably about $100 million in bonds now, not one penny is on tax roll. Not one.

The financing went with Don Schultz and now we have a new finance director, Ray Wilcovich (phonetic) and all of it so far has been on the planners and developers and the one-cent sales tax.

MR. ADLER: If you don't want to comment tonight verbally, that's fine. The facts sheet has something you can mail to me with my name on it already. Just put a stamp on it.

We are accepting it until the end of the month or on the Internet.

MR. FIGGAROA: I would like to comment. Tony Figgaroa, 921 Oak Tree Lane. There's some confusion

back there. The lady asked about containment cells. The EPA has years of experience in the design of containment cells and I just wanted to give a few good -- just set her at ease that this is not something new; that we have been doing this for years.

The containment cell is an effort to be able to solve some of the issues otherwise it's very, very expensive. It can go into millions and millions of dollars hauling that stuff to a landfill site, so if you could reiterate the number of years that the EPA has on the design of containment cells and that they are safe.

MR. ADLER: Sure. That was sort of a comment and a question. Again, we've got three containment cells out here since 1992. The former boat Slip #3 and the containment cell and the eastern cell and the western cell contains PCB material, about 50 parts per million. OMC built those when they dredged the harbor down here.

They are surrounded by a subsurface barrier wall and they have a cover system over it. There is also pumping wells in each of those cells that pump water out from the interior of it to keep the ground water lower inside than outside, so that if

there is a leak in the walls, water is going to flow outside rather than in.

I don't know how many years necessarily we have experience in designing and building containment cells, per se, but municipal landfills, laws and regulations are always under review trying to make them better.

These particular cells have not been broached, they have not leaked since they were put into the ground in 1992. If the City continues to operate and maintain them properly, and operate means pump the water out and treat it so there's no PCBs in it, keep the inward ground water gradient and maintain it at least to fix any holes in the surface like animals burrowing in there so there's not a portal for water to go in there or animals go in there and create an access and to remove PCB-containing material and put it out on the surface that somebody may come into contact with.

MS. GRADY: Peggie Grady, 1018 North Sheridan Road. It's sort of hard to make a comment without having questions. I understand what you're saying about containment cells and these are Waukegan PCBs and it's part of the Waukegan industry and for the most part it should stay in Waukegan.

I think my concern is the harbor and the dredging of the harbor. And this is kind of a question I guess to the Mayor in my comment: Why do we want to dredge the harbor more?

Okay. Let me -- my train of thought gets -- you want to expand the containment cells so that you could have a future site to put the PCBs from the dredging of the harbor?

MR. ADLER: Actually, that's our proposal; is to contain our material from the OMC plant to property out there, but also be prepared to accept any material from the harbor if it happens to occur that way.

Right now I understand the harbor cleanup plans call for dredging it and removing the material to an off-site landfill. If that proves to be too expensive, to take all that material over the road to a landfill, some of it could be consolidated and placed on the north plant property. Not all of it, some of it, to try to save money.

What I am doing tonight is proposing to consolidate the material from the north plant in this area and leave the opportunity open for all of the harbor sediment to be placed there as well. If the harbor sediments don't go there, then we won't do it.

We'll still be cleaning up the north plant and proposing to contain the material between the present containment cells.

THE AUDIENCE: So you would have the potential to put contaminated soil whether from the harbor or from someplace else?

MR. ADLER: No. I can only put material from the OMC Superfund site on the --

MS. GRADY: Which includes the harbor; so it's back to the dredging of the harbor to have this expanded containment cell, correct?

MR. ADLER: If the harbor project goes forward where it becomes cost effective and, let's say, doable to place material on the north plant and in a landfill, instead of all in a landfill, and then this proposal tonight provides for that.

If it's decided under the harbor cleanup action that any material does not go to the north plant area, it all goes to a landfill, we are still going to take our soil that's below 50 parts per million and consolidate it out there, but not prepare to accept harbor sediment.

THE AUDIENCE: Okay, but like in the facts sheet, the EPA proposed -- that said that you wanted to

have space for the harbor --

MR. ADLER: If it does happen that way. If the harbor cleanup action happens. No. 1, it has to happen. So material has to be placed on the north plant to make it economical to go, because there's only a limited amount of money for people to spend to do that harbor cleanup work, then we're making preparations to accept it.

THE AUDIENCE: If you have that extra space in the containment cell, that would make it easier to dredge the harbor, because the harbor does have some place to put their contaminated soil?

MR. ADLER: Yes.

THE AUDIENCE: I guess I'm opposed to that, because I don't know if I necessarily want the harbor to be dredged, because if Waukegan is going to be turning the lakefront into a recreational and residential area, we don't -- I don't think we would want this harbor dredged so we can have those large ships coming in. I mean, you don't need a 23-foot craft --

MAYOR HYDE: That's why I say if you read the paper, the harbor is not going to be dredged -- is not going to be dredged so all those boats can come in with

bigger loads. The only thing that the Corp of Engineers is going to do is take the top soil where PCBs are in there and dredge. That's it. It's not to make the harbor deeper than what it is now.

THE AUDIENCE: They may bring in less ships with more tonnage, but the plants that are there now are pretty much to capacity.

MS. GRADY: Okay.

MR. JOYCE: It's an environmental dredging.

THE AUDIENCE: So how deep will the harbor come when -- after it's dredged?

MR. ADLER: If the harbor work goes ahead as proposed by the City, it will go down to about 23 feet below mean water surface.

MAYOR HYDE: It's about 20, 21 now.

MR. ADLER: The approximate amount of material in the harbor targeted for removal is about 250,000 cubic yards.

THE AUDIENCE: Besides the fact you remove the harbor material, that is an important part, but you want people to be able to eat the fish from the harbor safely.

MR. ADLER: Okay. Thank you for your comments. Are you ready for the pop quiz? The first

person or the second person to answer I've got a nice prize.

Who can tell me the chemical of concern inside the Plant 2 building?

THE AUDIENCE: PCB.

MR. ADLER: Who owns the Plant 2 site?

THE AUDIENCE: The City.

MR. ADLER: Now the hard one. How much is our proposed plan going to cost? Remember, the state is going pay 10 percent.

Thank you for coming. If you don't have anymore comments, we'll wrap it up. Again, your facts sheet has a mailer that you can mail comments to me and we'll take them by e-mail as well. The website will do it and fax also.

(End of Proceedings.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS:
COUNTY OF L A K E)

I, ANNAMARIE BLOCK, CSR, a Notary Public in and for the County of Lake, State of Illinois, do hereby certify that subject to the usual terms and conditions of McCorkle Court Reporters, Inc., that the above hearing was recorded stenographically by me and reduced to typewriting by me; that the hearing is a true, correct and complete transcript of the entire hearing given by said parties at the time and place hereinabove set forth; that the proofreading of this transcript was done by a proofreader other than myself.

I further certify that I am not counsel for, nor in any way interested in the outcome thereof.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this 29th day of January, A.D. 2007.

ANNAMARIE BLOCK, CSR

My commission expires: 8/12/2007

WORD INDEX